

REMARKS

This responds to the **December 27, 2007** Final Office Action.

In the Office Action, claims 111-114, 116-120, 127, 129, and 131-138 are noted as pending in the application, claims 111-114, 116-120, 127, 129, and 131-138 stand rejected, claim 138 is objected to and no claims are allowed.

Claim 111 has been amended without prejudice, and claims 111-114, 116-120, 127, 129 and 131-134 are now pending. Claims 121-126 and now 135-138 have been withdrawn from consideration without prejudice.

Information Disclosure Statement

A Third Information Disclosure Statement was filed January 16, 2008. Applicant respectfully requests an indication that the Third Information Disclosure Statement has been considered and made of record.

Examiner Interview Summary

Applicant appreciates the courtesy and time devoted by the Examiner and the Supervisory Patent Examiner to discussing this case. In addition to discussing Dangi, Applicant summarized several points about the present application and its differences with Enright, and the significance of viewing low latency images.

Objections

Claim 138 is objected to because of the following informalities: Line 11 recites "at a web server". The web server is previously recited in line 9 therefore the phrase will be interpreted to read "at the web server". Appropriate correction is required. Claim 138 has been withdrawn without prejudice, which also obviates this objection.

Rejections

Claims 111-114, 116-120, 127, 129, 131, 133, and 135-138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Enright et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,583,813). It is asserted that Enright teaches remote live video monitoring of areas of interest, and "virtually simultaneously" providing to a remote user images from the

area of interest. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, for the reasons stated previously, and also because the configuration used in Enright does not result in viewing of live video. Instead, as noted in Enright,

“As can be appreciated from the configuration in FIG. 10 an authorized user operating a user terminal can access image data by accessing the image server with a browser and recovering image data from memory. This configuration further facilitates analysis of image data by being able to correlate transaction activity and the operation of transaction function devices with image data. Further the capability of the exemplary embodiment of the invention to capture image and transaction data while virtually simultaneously delivering image and transaction data to a remote user, facilitates maintaining ATM 146 in operation.”

See, Enright, column 28, lines 51-57 (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that recovering image data from memory, which appears to be the only exemplary embodiment disclosed in Enright, does not result in live video, especially when compared to a structure such as that recited in amended claim 111. In amended claim 111, the camera streamer associated with the selected camera is configured for providing live second video signals to the computer communications network addressed to the client computer terminal.

Claim 132 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Enright et al. in view of Kuno (U.S. Patent No. 6,567,121). Regarding claim 132 in the recent Office Action, the Office Action states that Enright et al. is silent with regards to denying a control request when a camera is being controlled by another terminal. Kuno et al. discloses this in 5:6-11, 5:36-42, 5:48-51, and 6:61-67 and Fig. 9. An advantage to doing this allows clients to be queued for gaining the right of camera access as Kuno shows in 6:61-67. For this reason it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have Enright's system include denying a control request when a camera is being controlled by another terminal.

Applicant's Disclosure

Applicant's disclosure has been discussed previously and that discussion will not be repeated here.

It is noted that the present amendment to claim 111 is supported in the original specification, for example at page 16, lines 20 and following. There it is stated that "In response to the request, the camera manager broadcasts a stream of live video onto the network addressed to the appropriate client computer". Additionally, claim 94 of the International Application as published states that "said camera manager is a camera streamer". No new matter is added.

Cited Prior Art

The claims have been rejected on Enright (claims 111-114, 116-120, 127, 129, 131, 133, and 135-138) or Enright in view of Kuno (claim 132) or Enright in view of Dangi (claim 134). These rejections are moot in view of the amendment to claim 111.

Claims

Consider now the claims in the application.

Claim 111 is an independent apparatus claim and recites in part:

"at least one client computer terminal configured for linking to the network for providing the predetermined schedule, for receiving and displaying to an operator the playback second signals to allow the operator to review past events, and for allowing the operator to request a live video signal; and

"wherein, in response to a request from a client computer terminal for a live video signal from a selected camera, the camera streamer associated with the selected camera is configured for providing live second video signals to the computer communications network addressed to the client computer terminal which issued the request, and wherein the client computer terminal is configured for receiving and displaying to the operator the live second video signals to allow the operator to view events live.

None of the applied references taken singly or in combination teach or suggest the claimed combination, the recited elements quoted above, or wherein a camera streamer associated with the selected camera is configured for providing live second video signals to the computer communications network addressed to the client computer terminal which issued the request, and wherein the client computer terminal is configured for receiving and displaying to the operator the live second video signals to allow the operator to view events live. Clearly claim 111 is patentable over the applied references.

Claims 112-114, 116-120, 127, 129, 131-134 are dependent directly or indirectly from independent claim 111 and are asserted as being patentable for the same reasons as discussed with respect to claim 111, for the combinations in the dependent claims as well as for the additional limitations recited in the dependent claims.

Reconsideration of the application and claims in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks is respectfully requested. Early notice of allowance thereof is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner does not believe the foregoing amendments place the application in a condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request the courtesy of a telephone interview to discuss the claims.

This response is being filed with an RCE, and payment for A Three-Month Extension of Time.

Application No.: 10/049,449
Amendment dated: June 30, 2008
Reply to Office Action of: **December 27, 2007**
Atty. Ref.: 010100-109

Please charge any additional fees that may be due or credit any overpayments to our deposit Account No. 50-0655. If a petition is required in conjunction with this paper, please consider this a request for such a petition.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 30, 2008

/James A Henricks/

James A. Henricks

Registration No. 31,168

HENRICKS, SLAVIN & HOLMES LLP
840 Apollo Street, Suite 200
El Segundo, CA 90245-4737
310-563-1456
310-563-1460 (fax)
jhenricks@hsh-iplaw.com (Email)